ITG Request #031

SPECIFICS	DESCRIPTION		
Title	**Combine True Names and Aliases for Time Pay**		
Description	This request would enable court staff at all courts of limited jurisdiction to create a single time pay agreement for individuals with cases under both true names and any known aliases. Court staff would save time by being able to combine accounts receivable from multiple cases into one time pay agreement. Individuals with multiple accounts receivable would be able to make a single payment.		
CLUG	Courts Limited Jurisdiction		
CLUG Vote	Unanimous Yes	CLUG Score (if available)	23 out of 50
CLUG Priority	**1** (Only request considered by the CLJ CLUG thus far)		

	ANALYSIS RESULT		
AOC Hours (Equivalent Cost)	940 hours ($66,740)		
Contractor Costs	None		
Estimated **Minimum** Project Duration	6 months		
Type of Resources	Legacy (JIS)	Type of Resources	Internal
Total Estimated Cost	940 hours ($66,740)		

DELEGATION MATRIX RESULT	
Send to:	JISC (AOC Administrator delegated authority limited to $50,000)

Combine True Name and Aliases for timepay

Request Detail

Requestor Name:
Vance, Aimee R

Origination Date:
09/21/2010

Requestor Email:
avance@ci.kirkland.wa.us

Requestor Phone:
425-587-3163

Recommended Endorser:
District and Municipal Court Management Association

Request Status: Awaiting CLUG Recommendation

Request Type: Change or Enhancement

Which Systems are affected? Judicial Information System (JIS)

Other affected Systems / Business Processes

Business Area: Accounting

Communities Impacted: County Clerks
Superior Court Administrators
CLJ Managers

Impact if not Resolved: Medium

Impact Description:
A person could be set up on two different timepay agreements and required to make 2 payments in one month rather than a consolidated payment.

What is the Business Problem or Opportunity

This is unresolved change requests #33 and #164

#33 - Courts want a function to combine all ARs for a true name and aliases to put on timepay.

#164 - Court has requested that cases attached to a person's AKA as well as true name be available on TPSE.

Expected Benefit:
The court user would be able to see all ARs for the person and set up one timepay for the individual regardless of the name the case was filed under.

Any Additional Information:

Endorsement Detail

Endorsing Committee
District and Municipal Court Management Association

Endorser Name:
Vance, Aimee R

Origination Date:
09/21/2010

Endorser Email:
avance@ci.kirkland.wa.us

Endorser Phone:
425-587-3163

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments
This request was discussed by the Endorsement Group at a previous meeting.

AOC Analysis Detail

Analysis Date: 09/30/2010

Request Rationale

Aligns with JIS Business Priorities, IT Strategies & Plans: Yes

Aligns with applicable policies and with ISD Standards: Yes

Breadth of Solution Benefit: Wide

Cost Estimates

Cost Benefit Analysis Complete? No

Cost to Implement? 940 hours

Key Business Objectives:

This request seeks to enable all Accounts Receivables for a true name and associated aliases to be combined on the TPSE screen. This change will only affect the CLJs.

Benefits and Business Value:

This change will allow court personnel to see all accounts receivable for a person and set up a single Time Pay for the individual no matter which name the case was filed under. Currently the courts have to set up a Time Pay agreement for each name which can result in an individual having to make two payments in a month rather than a single, combined payment.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Solution

The solution that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) proposes will allow courts to combine Accounts Receivable (AR) for a true name and aliases

Positive Return on Investment?

Projected Maintenance cost? None

Feasibility Study needed? No

Court Level User Group

Courts of Limited Jurisdiction

into a single Time Pay agreement. This enhancement will function in the same way that the system currently allows courts to combine multiple ARs for a true name into a single Time Pay.

AOC Analysis - Proposed Approach

AOC proposes to provide the ability to combine ARs from aliases into the true name ARs to create a single Time Pay. When a true name has associated aliases, court staff will be given an opportunity to select which ARs associated with the aliases will be combined into a single Time Pay. This request would impact screens: TPSC, TPSE, and RCP. In addition, Time Pay statements and Time Pay reports would also be affected. AOC anticipates a change to the data schema and a probable data conversion as part of this effort.

Additional Systems Affected

Addtional Court Communities Affected

AOC Analysis Attachments

ITG Request 031 - Combine True Names and Aliases for Timepay.docx

Confirmation of Endorsing Action Detail

Endorsing Committee

District and Municipal Court Management Association

Endorser Name:

Vance, Aimee R

Origination Date:

10/07/2010

Endorser Email:

avance@ci.kirkland.wa.us

Endorser Phone:

425-587-3163

Endorsing Action: Endorsed

Endorser's Explanation and Comments

Analysis of IT Governance Request #031
Combine True Name and Aliases for Time Pay

Summary of Proposed Solution:
The solution that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) proposes will allow courts to combine Accounts Receivable (AR) for a true name and aliases into a single Time Pay agreement. This enhancement will function in the same way that the system currently allows courts to combine multiple ARs for a true name into a single Time Pay.

Sizing:
The following estimate is based upon the best available information and does not include cost or effort estimates for on-going maintenance of the enhancement. This analysis was approved by AOC's Operations Control Board on September 30th, 2010.

This enhancement would be accomplished by AOC's internal resources. The systems affected by the change would be: JIS.

AOC estimates that this project would take 6 months to complete. This is an estimate of the duration of the project from the date work would begin on the project until final implementation.

Group	Hours	Tasks
Court Education	60	Update documentation, help desk.
Business Analysis	40	Requirements development.
Architecture	0	
Maintenance (JIS)	700	Data design, data conversion, coding, and unit testing.
Data Warehouse	0	
Quality Assurance	240	Testing and validation.
Project Management	0	
Total	**940 hours**	

ISD staff costs average $76 per hour. Contractor staff generally costs $120 - $150 per hour.

Request:
This request seeks to enable all Accounts Receivables for a true name and associated aliases to be combined on the TPSE screen.

Business Impacts:
This change will allow court personnel to see all accounts receivable for a person and set up a single Time Pay for the individual no matter which name the case was filed under. Currently the courts have to set up a Time Pay agreement for each name which can result in an individual having to make two payments in a month rather than a single, combined payment.

Proposed Solution:
AOC proposes to provide the ability to combine ARs from aliases into the true name ARs to create a single Time Pay. When a true name has associated aliases, court staff will be given an opportunity to select which ARs associated with the aliases will be combined into a single Time Pay. This request would impact screens: TPSC, TPSE, and RCP. In addition, Time Pay statements and Time Pay reports would also be affected. AOC anticipates a change to the data schema and a probable data conversion as part of this effort.

Assumptions:

1. If this request and the IT Governance Request #26 - Prioritize Restitution Recipients requests are both approved, they should be scheduled at the same time as some requirements may be contradictory and must be harmonized.
2. Once this request is approved, the technical team will identify specific changes to the schema. Depending upon the specific solution selected, some hours may be required from the Data Warehouse.

Risks:

1. Several known errors exist for Time Pay and these may impact this request.
2. Time Pay is a complex process and this request could be more difficult than anticipated due to this factor.

IT GOVERNANCE REQUEST DECISION

Recommend Decision (4th step) From Court Level User Group (CLUG)

Court Level User Group	**Courts of Limited Jurisdiction**
Chair of Group	Cynthia Marr

IT Request - #31, Combine True Name and Aliases for Time Pay								
Date of Decision - October 7, 2010								
Decision to Recommend for Approval	✓ **Approve** *(unanimously)* ☐ **Decline** *(unanimously)* ☐ **Split Vote:** *moves forward to JISC with pros & cons*							
Prioritization of Request	**# 1**							
Scoring of Request	**Business Value** (1-10)	**Relative Priority** (1-10)	**Cost** (1-5)	**Complexity/ Level of Effort** (1-10)	**Risk** (1-5)	**Benefit /Impact** (1-5)	**Impact of Doing Nothing** (1-5)	**Request Total Score** (0-50)
	3.5	**5**	**3**	**6**	**2.5**	**3**	**0**	**23**
Pros & Cons *(if vote is not unanimous)*								
Additional Statements *(attachments from other groups in support or additional information that should go to the JISC for consideration)*	✓ **No** = additional statements/attachments ☐ **Yes** = additional statements/attachments							
Additional Notes	Note: Request is currently priority number one because there are no other requests before the CLJ CLUG at this time. If both this request and Request #26 (Prioritize Restitution Receipts) are approved, the CLJ CLUG would ask that the two requests be combined, as recommended in the AOC analysis.							

IT GOVERNANCE IT REQUEST DECISIONS

Courts of Limited Jurisdiction Level Priority List

Priority	Request #	Title	Date Approved
1	31	Combine True Name and Aliases for Time Pay	10/7/10
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

JISC Guidance on IT Governance Priorities, Exclusions & Decision Criteria

Adopted at the June 25, 2010 JISC Meeting

Priorities: "What Matters"

The Judicial Information System Committee (JISC) has identified the following priorities to guide decision-making on information technology (IT) requests.

- **Provide Infrastructure**
  Supply court communities and AOC with the necessary hardware, network and other infrastructure needed to access JIS.
- **Maintain Portfolio**
  Maintain existing portfolio of JIS applications, providing baseline[1] functionality.
- **Integrate to Inform**
  Enable data, applications and information to be shared and combined in meaningful and useful ways.
- **Modernize Applications**
  Replace, enhance and otherwise modernize JIS applications.

Exclusions: "Requests not considered in the JIS IT Governance Process"

As IT requests are reviewed and evaluated as part of the new IT Governance process, certain types of requests will be excluded[2] from consideration:

- Data that does not need to be shared.
- Practices that are not common or shared.

[1] Defining "baseline functionality" has been defined as an action item from the May 19, 2010 JISC Work Session.

[2] Exclusions may change due to the outcome of future discussion and decisions about centralization and decentralization.

Criteria: "How to Choose"

JISC has identified the following high-level criteria to apply to IT requests. These criteria will be applied when deciding between competing IT requests and to ensure requests align with the priorities above.

- ✓ **Enhance Access** – provide better access to data and better access to Justice by facilitating the exchange of data between databases and systems and provide reporting that informs court stakeholders statewide.

  Characteristics
  - *Support all court levels statewide (Data Exchanges, Reporting, Data, Images, e-Applications such as e-Filing, etc.)*

- ✓ **Improve Decision-making** – provide business tools to ensure all JIS users (the bench, clerks, administrators and others) are better able to make necessary and informed decisions and adhere to authorizing statutes, rules, policies and principles.

  Characteristics
  - *Address all judicial roles: Bench, Clerks, Administrators, users/others*
  - *Provide person-based information*
  - *Compliance with RCW, WAC, Access to Justice Principles, JISC Rules, etc.*

- ✓ **Advance Performance** – enable measurable improvements to business processes provided by investments in automation of process and workflow. Qualitative improvements result in enhanced trust and better outcomes in the Judicial process.

  Characteristics
  - *Process improvements (e.g., automated process / workflow)*
  - *Qualitative measures (e.g., outcomes, trust)*
  - *Reduced complexity*

- ✓ **Quantify Value** – measure impacts to overall Judicial process and user communities, through calculations such as Return on Investment (ROI), Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA), Total Cost of Ownership (TCO), etc.

  Characteristics
  - *Quantifiable ROI, CBA, TCO, etc.*
  - *Reduced Risk*

- ✓ **Adherence to JISC Standards** – established technology and data standards provide a consistent basis for making IT investment decisions and building a high-functioning, robust and cohesive technology and applications portfolio.

  Characteristics
  - *Enterprise Architecture and Data standards, Buy/Build considerations, etc.*

IT Governance Request Process – Recommend Step
"Scoring Criteria Guide"

	Scoring Criteria	Scoring	Criteria Description and Scoring Guide
1	Business Value	0-10 10=high	Benefits to court client staff / users represented by return on investment, net present value, cost avoidance, cost reduction metrics. 0 = low business value and unclear linkages to JISC priorities, business plan and IT strategy 10 = high business value and strong linkages to JISC priorities, business plan and IT strategy
2	Relative Priority	0-10 10=high	Priority ranking from community of interest. 0 = relatively low priority in relation to other requests 10 = a relatively high priority in relation to other requests
3	Cost	0-5 5=low	Total cost of effort; available funding sources; total cost of ownership. 0 = requires additional funding or complex funding sources (e.g., appropriation, grants, cross-agency funding) 5 = low cost factor – able to accomplish effort with existing or budgeted funding sources
4	Complexity / Level of Effort	0-10 10=low	Total consumption and availability of resources and volume, throughput, type of activity, degree of introduced change, previous/existing successes. 0 = requires additional resources/expertise not available within ISD capacity 10 = low complexity – able to accomplish effort with existing resources; aligns with technology infrastructure and supports enterprise architecture standards
5	Risk	0-5 5=low	Acceptability of Risk level based on risk analyses, and ability to mitigate and/or manage risks (assess both likelihood and level of risk.) 0 = high impact level and likelihood of risk occurring 5 = low impact level and likelihood of risk occurring
6	Breadth of Benefits / Impacts	0-5 5=broad	Supportive of consistent experience across Judicial space, avoidance of adverse consequences and function not previously provided, addressing incomplete functions, extending capture/exchange of data. 0 = Request specific to a narrow scope of a single/few courts or jurisdictions 5 = Broad impact across courts, jurisdictions, or systems.
7	Impact of Doing Nothing	0-5 5= high impact	Cost / Impact of not responding to the request now. 0 = workarounds exist 5 = high negative impact if no response, no workarounds or workarounds not viable
Maximum Score: 50			

IT Governance Request Worksheet			JISC Senior Level Guidance									Scoring Criteria							Score Results		Recommend to JISC
			Business Priority (Assign Y/N)				Decision Criteria Aligned Y/N)														
IT Request	Total Cost		Provide Infra-structure	Maintain Portfolio	Integrate to Inform	Modernize Applications	Enhance Access	Improve Decision Making	Advance Performance	Quantify Value	Adhere to JISC standards	Business Value (0-10)	Relative Priority (0-10)	Cost (0-10) [higher cost scores lower]	Complexity/ level of effort (0-10)	Risk (0-5) [higher risk scores lower]	Breadth of Benefit and impact (0-5)	Impact of doing nothing (0-5)	Project Score (0-50)	Project Prioritization (1=highest)	
	Total Estimated Cost	Estimated AOC Hours																			
Come True Names and Aliases for Time Pay Agreements	$66,740	940										3.5	5	3	6	2.5	3	0	23	1 (only request considered to date)	Approve
Grand Total																					